

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lim (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,966 B1), hereafter “Lim.” Applicant asserts that Lim does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15, Applicant submits that Lim fails to teach or suggest preserving a user state in a single application used to process transactions to a plurality of users in a stateless online environment. Rather, Lim deals with recovery of an entire system and not a single application. Further, Lim does not teach or suggest that the system which is recovered is an application that is used to process transactions to a plurality of users. Further, Lim does not teach that its system is a stateless environment.

In contrast, the claimed invention includes “...preserving a user state in a single application used to process transactions to a plurality of users in a stateless online environment.”

Claim 1. Thus, the Lim does not teach or suggest the preserving of the user state of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that Lim also fails to teach or suggest automatically transporting the user to the particular milestone when the user logs into the application. The Office admits that Lim does not teach this feature of the claimed invention, but states that “many web access requires user authentication/login.” Office Action, page 2. Applicant objects to the Office’s use of Official and asserts that the Office’s factual assertion is not properly based upon common knowledge. For example, Applicant asserts that the automatic transporting of a user to a milestone within the runtime execution of an application upon login is not obvious to one skilled in the art as asserted by the Office. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is not an obvious motivation to incorporate a login/authentication, as asserted by the Office because Lim does not teach that its system is a web application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office support the finding with references that show these features or withdraw the rejection.

With respect to the Office’s other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: December 17, 2007

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew